



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,730	08/09/2005	William R Blackwood	DC5018 PCT 1	6040

137 7590 10/30/2008  
DOW CORNING CORPORATION CO1232  
2200 W. SALZBURG ROAD  
P.O. BOX 994  
MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994

EXAMINER
----------

OJURONGBE, OLATUNDE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The Amendment filed 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-8 and 10-18 remain pending in the application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

**Claims 1- 8 and 10-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Young et al (US 4,212,897)**.

Regarding **claim 1**, Young et al discloses a composition (Abstract, line 1) consisting:

- an organopolysiloxane containing hydroxyl groups (Abstract, lines 3-4); this serves as component (A) of the instant claim,
- a hydrolysable organic titanium compound or a partial hydrolyzate thereof (Abstract, lines 5-6); this serves as component (C) of the instant claim,

Young et al further exemplifies the components of the composition (Example XIII, col. 16, lines 45-53):

- 10g siloxane copolymer X2-5056 (col.16, lines 50-51 ), this serves as component (A) of the instant claim,
- 10g dimethylpolysiloxane fluid (col.16, line 52); this serves as component (B) of the instant claim,

Art Unit: 1796

- 10g dimethylpolysiloxane fluid (co1.16, line 52); this serves as component (B) of the instant claim,
- 10 g tetraisopropyl titanate (co1.16, line 49); this serves as component (C) of the instant claim.

Though the organopolysiloxane containing hydroxyl groups of example XIII does not disclose  $\text{RSiO}_{3/2}$  units, Young et al further discloses that the polysiloxane may be predominantly a monoorganopolysiloxane (col.2, lines 37-38); therefore, substituting the siloxane copolymer X2-5056 of example XIII with a polysiloxane that is predominantly monorganopolysiloxane (in the disclosed amount) would have amounted to nothing more than the use of a known element for its intended use in a known environment in order to achieve entirely expected result.

Regarding **claims 2-3**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above. Though Young et al does not explicitly disclose the R on the monoorganopolysiloxane being methyl, since the disclosed R on the siloxane copolymer X2-5056 (co1.16, lines 50-51) is methyl, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a monoorganopolysiloxane with methyl.

Regarding **claims 4-5**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above. The R on the disclosed dimethylpolysiloxane (co1.16, line 52) is methyl.

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding **claims 6-8**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above. The disclosed tetraisopropyl titanate (co1.16, line 49) conforms to the formula of the metal alkoxide of the instant claim, where M is titanium and each R<sup>4</sup> is isopropyl.

10g of tetraisopropyl titanate is 100 parts per 100 part of the monoorganopolysiloxane.

Regarding **claims 10-12 and 16**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above and further discloses the composition containing 30g perchloroethylene (co1.16, line 53).

30g perchloroethylene is 300 parts per 100 part of the monoorganopolysiloxane.

Regarding **claim 13**, Young et al discloses a solution (co1.16, line 47) prepared by mixing (co1.16, line 55):

- 10g siloxane copolymer X2-5056 (co1.16, lines 50-51), this serves as component (A) of the instant claim,
- 10g dimethylpolysiloxane fluid (co1.16, line 52); this serves as component (B) of the instant claim,
- 10 g tetraisopropyl titanate (co1.16, line 49); this serves as component (C) of the instant claim.

Though the siloxane copolymer X2-5056 does not disclose RSiO<sub>3/2</sub> units, Young et al further discloses that the polysiloxane may be predominantly a monoorganopolysiloxane (co1.2, lines 37-38); therefore, substituting the siloxane

Art Unit: 1796

copolymer X2-5056 of example XIII with a polysiloxane that is predominantly monorganopolysiloxane (in the disclosed amount) would have amounted to nothing more than the use of a known element for its intended use in a known environment in order to achieve entirely expected result.

Regarding **claims 14-15 and 18**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above and further discloses applying the composition of the invention to a large number of substrates, including wood (co1.6, lines 27-28 and co1.6, line 42).

Regarding **claim 17**, modified Young et al discloses all the claim limitations as set forth above and further discloses mixing 30g perchloroethylene (co1.16, line 53).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's argument that all the examples taught by Young provide that the organopolysiloxane(s) are present in equal or greater amounts than the titanate, the limitations of the instant claims are met when the organopolysiloxanes and titanate of Young are in equal amount because components (A), (B) and (C) of the instant claim, which are the organopolysiloxane(s) and titanate of Young can each be present in an amount of 100 parts by weight according to the instant claim. (See instant claim 1).

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding the applicant's argument that the applicant's invention requires that the titanate be present in amounts greater than the organopolysiloxane of component (B), the instant claim actually emphasizes that the amount of component (C) in the composition be equal to or greater than the amount of component (B) (see instant claim 1), hence, the instant claims are rendered obvious when the amount of the titanate and the dimethylpolysiloxane fluid of Young are equal as exemplified in example XIII. Moreover, the disclosure of Young is by no means limited to the working examples. Concerning the applicant's argument about the improved stability of the present invention when the component (C) is equal to or larger than the component (B) for which the applicant refers to Tables 2 and 4, the examiner notes that while Example 30 shows an excellent stability, Examples 33 and 37 show fair stability with the components (C) and (B) being equal in all examples (see Table 4). Also, Table 3 illustrates Examples 17, 18 and 19, all with poor initial stability and good final stability, the component (C) is smaller than component (B) in 17, the component (C) is larger than component (B) in 18, and the component (C) is equal to component (B) in 19. From the results shown in the Tables above, one can conclude that there is more to obtaining desirable stability result than adjusting the amounts of components (B) and (C), therefore, the applicant's argument of improved stability when component C is equal to or larger than component (B) is not persuasive as it fails to indicate that the amount of component (C) being equal to or larger than component (B) is critical in obtaining better stability result.

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLATUNDE S. OJURONGBE whose telephone number is (571)270-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7.15am-4.45pm, EST time, Alt Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571)272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

O.S.O.

/Margaret G. Moore/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
10/25/08